

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.               | FILING DATE             | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 10/658,439                    | 09/08/2003              | Larry White          | SONY-26600              | 4739            |
| Jonathan O. O                 | 7590 02/25/2019<br>wens | EXAM                 | EXAMINER                |                 |
| HAVERSTOC                     | K & OWENS LLP           | PARK, JEONG S        |                         |                 |
| 162 North Wo<br>Sunnyvale, CA |                         | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER            |                 |
|                               |                         |                      | 2454                    |                 |
|                               |                         |                      | MIT BUT                 | DEL MEDILLORE   |
|                               |                         |                      | MAIL DATE<br>02/25/2010 | DELIVERY MODE   |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |  |  |
|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/658,439      | WHITE ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit     |  |  |
| JEONG S. PARK   | 2454         |  |  |
| JEUNG S. PARK   | 2434         |  |  |

|  | JEONG S. PARK   | 2454   |                                     |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address  |   |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 11 January 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A  | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR  | R ALLOWANCE.                                     |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>\(\text{\$\texitext{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\tex{</li></ol> | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi<br>eal (with appeal fee) in compliance        | t, or other evidence, w<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; or | vhich places the<br>r (3) a Request |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing</li> </ul>   | g date of the final rejection.  |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or the MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07   | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing<br>(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE         | date of the final rejection                      | on.                                 |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1,136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension flee under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a set for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the malling date of the final rejection, even if timely filed may reduce any semed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL  |   |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was compared.   | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the                           |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| AMENDMENTS   |   |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet  | nsideration and/or search (see NOTow);  | TE below);                                       |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a ∈  | corresponding number of finally reje  | ected claims.                                    |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).   |   |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.   |   | mpliant Amendment (I                             | PTOL-324).                          |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>   |   |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:  |   | l be entered and an e                            | cplanation of                       |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-42.   |   |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |   |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |   |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   | d sufficient reasons why the affidavi   | it or other evidence is                          | necessary and                       |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>   | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea<br>y and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fail<br>ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | s to provide a<br>).                |  |  |  |  |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio<br>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   | n of the status of the claims after er  | ntry is below or attach                          | ed.                                 |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu<br/>See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>   | t does NOT place the application in   | condition for allowan                            | ce because:                         |  |  |  |  |
| 12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. ☐ Other:  | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>01-10</u>   |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |
| /NATHAN FLYNN/<br>Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454   |   |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument, Carter in view of Hays teaches as follows:

Regarding claim 39, Carter teaches of automatically providing update information without user intervention (program to synchronize and update the user's audio/video files automatically from a multimedia database, e.e. e.g., page 4, paragraph [0031], lines 5-8). It is inherent that the program runs synchronization and update without user intervention.

Have teaches the deficiency of Carter as follows:

A content directory service to maintain directory information related to new content received (the distribution server provides its directory to the collection kiosk to retrieve the new information, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0022]);

Once the collection kiosk receives the update information, it can update its local list of registered users accordingly (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0022]);

The server interface (equivalent to applicant's interface layer) is responsible for accessing the central medical information system to retrieve updated content and registered user updates (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph (00261); and

The server interface stores the updated content in the web page directory (equivalent to applicant's content directory service) to overwrite or augment existing web page content (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0026]).

Therefore, Hays teaches an interface layer used in synchronization to discover the new content data and to provide update information...